

# UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY REGION III

#### 841 Chestnut Building Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107-4431

VIA TELEFAX

March 23, 1993

Ms. Sheryl Chesnutt Groundwater Technology, Inc. 223 Wilmington West Chester Pike Chadds Ford, PA 19317

Re: Stanley Kessler Superfund Site

Dear Ms. Chesnutt:

Attached are EPA's comments on the Draft Phase I Feasibility Study Report. As we discussed previously, it is appropriate to bring the Phase I Feasibility Study Report and the Phase II Feasibility Study Report together as one document. Therefore it is not necessary for you to respond to these comments in the context of the Phase I Feasibility Study Report but rather in the revised document which will be the Feasibility Study Report for the Site. Therefore the revised Feasibility Study Report is due in thirty days from today's date, i.e. April 22, 1993.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at (215) 597-3216.

Sincerely,

⁄Ruth Rzepskí

Remedial Project Manager

cc: J. Newbaker - EPA

- D. Ioven EPA
- S. Gianti EPA
- D. Ewald PADER

## 1.1 Purpose and Organization (p. 1-1)

1. An additional reference that should be consulted in preparing the FS is the document entitled "Guidance on Remedial Actions for Contaminated Ground Water at Superfund Sites" (EPA/541/G-88/003).

## 1.3.4.4 Conclusion (p.1-21)

2. It is stated that the upper boundary of the carcinogenic risk range is "not a discreet line at 1 x 10<sup>-04</sup>, and that a specific risk estimate around 10<sup>-4</sup> may be considered acceptable if justified based on site-specific conditions". It should be noted, however, that 1.0E-04 is, almost without exception, considered by EPA to be the upper bound for acceptable risk.

### 2.0 Identification and screening of Technologies (p. 2-1)

- 3. Soil contamination detected during the RI, although minimal, should still be addressed during the FS. The FS should include at a minimum an explanation of why soil remediation is not necessary or discuss the "no action" soil alternative in the screening analysis.
- 4. It is stated that the risk associated with ingestion of ground water at the site is "small". This is an inaccurate conclusion, however. For a child, the risk associated with exposure to contaminated ground water (via ingestion, inhalation of vapors during bathing, and dermal contact) is 2.8E-04, which exceeds EPA's upper boundary for carcinogenic risk.
- 5. It is stated on this page that "the medium of concern is ground water when directly ingested as a drinking water supply". It should also be noted in the report that ingestion of contaminated ground water is not the only route of concern; inhalation of vapors and dermal contact with ground water pose an additional risk.
- 6. It is stated that the results of the BLRA indicate "little or no threat to human health". Again, this is an erroneous conclusion and should be deleted from the report.

#### 2.1.2.1 Discussions of Key ARARs and TBCs

7. In this discussion, it should be acknowledged that risk-

based concentrations could potentially be selected as remediation goals.

## 2.1.3 Summary of Remedial Action Objectives (p. 2-3)

8. The single remedial action objective included in this section would be more accurately stated as follows: "Prevent exposure to site-related volatile organic chemical constituents in ground water at levels above health-based concentrations".

Additional remedial action objectives which should be considered in evaluating response actions include the following:

- Protect uncontaminated ground water and surface water for current and future use
  - Prevent contamination of existing wells that could be affected by the plume and in adjacent groundwater
  - Minimize migration of contaminants within the ground and surface water
  - Minimize migration of contaminants to adjacent ground and surface water
- Restore contaminated ground water for future use
  - Reduce contaminant concentrations within the are of the plume to levels that are safe for drinking
- Protect environmental receptors

#### 2.2.1 Determination of Quantity to be Remediated (p. 2-3).

9. There is no technical basis for assuming that the areal extent of ground water contamination is limited to the property boundaries. The horizontal extent of ground water contamination is in fact a data gap in the RI given that the furthest downgradient monitoring well (MW-6) exhibits a TCE concentration 26 times the MCL of 5 ppb. The estimated volume of impacted ground water is thus underestimated in the FS. The area of attainment encompasses the area outside the boundary of any waste remaining in place up to the boundary of the contaminant plume.

# 2.2.2 Identification of Applicable Response Actions (p. 2-4).

10. The FS should include an estimated restoration time frame for the no action alternative and for each alternative making it through to the detailed analysis. This

information will aid in evaluating the feasibility for the various alternatives. Guidance on estimating restoration time frames can be found in the document entitled "Guidance on Remedial Actions for Contaminated Ground Water at Superfund Sites" (EPA/540/G-88/003). Capy and Sites (EPA/540/G-88/003).

h90256696h <u></u> h90256696h C

CUSTOMER:
PLEASE REMOVE ONE OF THESE LABELS AND PLACE
IT ABOVE THE AIRBILL ON YOUR PACKAGE.

SERVICES  SERVICES  Check only one box)  Check only one box)  Check only one box)  Check only one box)  Check only one box  Check  Check only one box  Check  Check only one box  Check one box  Che	Street Address  841 CHESTNUT ST  City  PHILADELPHIA PA 19 10  YOUR INTERNAL BILLING REFERENCE INFORMATION (optional) (First 24 characters, will appear on implose).  PHYMENT 1 Bill Sender 2 Bill Recolomatic Feder Acct. No. Requal Film Account Number before (requi).  PHYMENT 1 Acct. No. Requal Film Account Number before (requi).	N 4  W DIPSER ACCOUNTS  -0196-0  me) Please Print Ruth Rzep	
UD SPECIAL HANDLING CACHES AND SERVICES FOOLITIES!  SERVICES FOOLITIES!  IN PICK-UP Frain in Book H)  IN PICK-UP Frain in Book H)  IN PICK-UP Frain in Book H)  IN PICK-UP  PECIAL SERVICE  DIM SHIPMENT(  IN PICK-UP  PECIAL SERVICE  PECIAL	7 Pain Creatica Pain Creatic	USE THE MARGINI FRAS SHIPMENTS INTIGHT THE CONTINHERS U.S.A. ALASKA AND HAWMA.  QUESTIONS? CALL BOD-238-5355 TOLL FREE.  96993  Paris  Date 3-30-93  Your Proofs Number (Very Important) Yo (Fleedpient's sk.1.  (215)597 3216  Ms. S. Sk.1.  Group	
SERVICE CONDITIONS, DECLARED VALUE AND LIMIT OF LABILITY  Use of this arbiticonstitute your appearment to the service conditions in our current Service Coulds, and appearment to the service conditions may vary for Government Constraint Con	trees (Nº Camal Dalleiro P.O. Spass or R.O. Zio Cad Willmington West Ches State ds Ford, PA  FROED FOR PICK-UP Frint FEDEX Address He Address Address City State	AIRBILL PACKAGE PACKING NUMBER 4957064  956995 1076 1076 1076 1076 1076 1076 1076 1076	